REMARKS

Attached hereto below is a copy of claims in the correct format and as filed as of 14 June 2004 as requested by the Examiner.

In the present amendment, independent claims 1, 12, and 14 are amended to particularly point out that the certifying is done by a client prior to deployment of the application at the client. Support is found in Applicants' specification page 1 lines 18 - 21, page 3 lines 20- 22, and page 7, lines 8 - 14. Claims 1, 12, and 14 are also amended to require the readiness assessment to include identifying a client business process owner. Support is found on page 9 line 2 of Applicants' specification. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 8 - 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bowman-Amuah (US Patent 6,662,357). Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12, and 14 above to clearly point out that the certification being done in these claims is being done by a software application client and not by the application developer as is described by Bowman-Amuah.

Specifically, in response to Examiner's comments in the office action dated 10/07/2004, Bowman-Amuah describe in column 20 lines 54 - 60 a request for data element changes during design, but does not describe or suggest entering a review request for certification of a software application by a client prior to deployment at said client as now required in claims 1, 12, and 14 as amended above. Bowman-Amuah's request for data element change is clearly done during design and might result in deciding that a data element should be changed. Applicants'

request occurs after design of the software application product is completed and the product is acquired by the client for certification prior to deployment at the client. Furthermore, Applicants' request may result in the certification of the software application product by the client. Bowman-Amuah does not describe or suggest this request for certification after design nor the resulting certification by the client.

Secondly, Applicants' claims 1, 12, and 14 as amended above requires performing a client readiness assessment including identifying a client business process owner. Bowman-Amuah does not describe or suggest in column 41 or anywhere, performing such a client readiness assessment. The reviews in column 41 are also done as the system is being developed.

Applicants' furthermore do not agree that Bowman-Amuah describes or suggests the separation of duties evaluation as required in claim 8. Although Bowman-Amuah describes various roles in column 11 lines 1 - 32, there is no requirement that the roles be performed by different people. On page 11, lines 13 - 24 clearly state that the separation of duties evaluation, required by claim 8, determines conflicting tasks and such identified conflicts must be performed by different people.

For the reasons stated above, claims 1, 12, and 14 are allowable over Bowman-Amuah and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 8 - 11, and 13 are all dependent directly or indirectly on allowable claims 1 or 12 and are therefore also allowable. Furthermore, claim 8 is also allowable for the reason given above. Allowance of claims 4, 8 - 11, and 13 is

respectfully requested.

Claims 3 and 5 - 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Bowman-Amuah in view of Gandel (US Patent 6,167,568). However claims 3 and 5 - 7 are all dependent directly or indirectly on allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/24/04

By: John Pivnichny

John R. Pivnichny
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358
Fax: (607)429-4119

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS (as filed 6/14/2004)

1. (original) A process for certifying a software application prior to deployment, comprising the steps of:

entering a review request for a software application into a staging database;

assigning a reviewer and scheduling a time for said review;

performing a readiness assessment prior to said time for said review;

conducting said review by said reviewer including providing an overview and process flows identifying control points, providing deliverables, and providing a test plan;

reporting results of said review; and

determining whether said results justify a decision of certification of said software application.

2. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said review request is entered into a spreadsheet database.

3. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said readiness assessment is performed by answering questions in a checklist.

4. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said overview comprises an application environmental overview and an

architectural overview.

5. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said process flows comprise flowcharts.

6. (original) The process of claim 5, wherein said flowcharts identify the position of automated or manual control points within the software application.

7. (original) The process of claim 5, wherein said control points include text describing actions to be taken for normal and exception control outcome.

8. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said review includes a separation of duties evaluation.

9. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said review includes an evaluation of control points that prevent unauthorized change to said software application.

10. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said test plan describes test scenarios and expected results for all said control points.

11. (original) The process of claim 1, wherein said review further comprises providing a demonstration.

12. (original) A process for certifying a software application, comprising the steps of:

entering a review request for a software application into a staging database;

assigning a reviewer and scheduling a time for said review;

performing a readiness assessment prior to said time for said review;

conducting said review by said reviewer including providing an overview and process flows identifying control points, providing deliverables, and providing a test plan;

reporting results of said review;

determining whether said results justify a decision of certification of said software application, and if so;

deploying said software application; and

executing at least a part of said test plan.

13. (original) The process of claim 12, wherein said review further comprises providing a demonstration.

14. (currently amended) A computer program product for instructing a processor to certify a software application, said computer program product comprising:

a computer readable medium;

first program instruction means for entering a review request for a software application into a staging database;

second program instruction means for assigning a reviewer and scheduling a time for said review;

third program instruction means for performing a readiness assessment prior to said time for said review;

fourth program instruction means for assisting said reviewer in conducting said review including assisting in providing an overview and process flows identifying control points, assisting in providing deliverables, and assisting in providing a test plan;

fifth program instruction means for reporting results of said review; and

sixth program instruction means for determining whether said results justify a decision of certification of said software application; and wherein

all said program instruction means are recorded on said medium.